



# TOWN OF SWAMPSCOTT

## OFFICE OF THE PLANNING BOARD

ELIHU THOMSON ADMINISTRATION BUILDING  
22 MONUMENT AVENUE, SWAMPSCOTT, MA 01907

### MEMBERS

PATRICK JONES, CHAIR  
ANGELA IPPOLITO, VICE CHAIR  
SYLVIA BELKIN  
JEFFREY BLONDER  
GEORGE POTTS

### STAFF

HELEN KENNEDY, SECRETARY  
S. PETER KANE, TOWN PLANNER

# OCTOBER 9, 2012 MEETING MINUTES

## *ZONING ARTICLE PUBLIC HEARING*

**Time:** 7:13 – 7:45 pm

**Location:** Swampscott Senior Center

**Members Present:** A. Ippolito, S. Belkin, J. Blonder

**Members Absent:** P. Jones, G. Potts

**Others Present:** Pete Kane (Town Planner), Bill Luster, Phil Singleton, Michael Callahan, Kait Taylor (Daily Item), Katrina Powell (Swampscott Reporter), Ken Shutzer (resident), Charles Donoghue (resident), Paul Minsky (resident), Sarah Pruett (resident)

Meeting called to order at 7:13 pm by Angela Ippolito, Vice Chair (acting chair for the hearing).

## SPECIAL TOWN MEETING ARTICLE 3 – PUBLIC HEARING

Acting Chair, A. Ippolito, opened the hearing by explaining that the purpose of the meeting was to review the proposed language for the zoning amendment which would come up for Town Meeting vote on October 15. Floor was given to article author, Bill Luster.

Mr. Luster explained the previous attempt from the May 2012 Town Meeting proposing rezoning of the Temple Planned Development District (PDD). The article during that vote did not pass the 2/3 requirement. They did outreach and additional research after that attempt in order to come up with the revised language that was now before the Planning Board.

Mr. Luster then provided additional historical information regarding the RFP process to select a developer for the Temple PDD. His team had responded to that RFP but they didn't like the concept of proposing a 42-unit building as zoning currently allows. Because the RFP allowed flexibility and inventiveness for the response, they came up with a village-home concept, owner-occupied. They felt the single-family homes are better suited for the market and fit within the neighborhood. They are proposing a 14-home subdivision through the zoning amendment – originally proposed 19 homes.

They've revised many of the dimensional requirements – increased the minimum frontage and setbacks, increased the parcel sizes, and reduced the maximum building coverage allowed. They've also done outreach and will be

mailing the materials to Town Meeting members and the neighborhood. J. Blonder asked how the last community meeting they held went. Mr. Luster said that people seemed to like the larger lot sizes and feel; general good feedback. Issues from the neighbors included desire that the new street be one-way, that no new driveways be created from Humphrey St, and that no fences along the property line but vegetated.

A question was raised about services to the subdivision. Mr. Luster stated that it will be served by town sewer and the shared driveway for three of the homes will be 17' wide instead of 11' per request of the Fire Department. They will also have a construction and dust plan. He also confirmed that a sidewalk would be included for the new subdivision. Trash pickup and plowing will be Town because it would be a public way. They are considering a homeowners agreement for landscape maintenance. They will also have a covenant to restrict that no additions will be allowed for 99 years. Ken Shutzer suggested that they should consider the same association used for One Salem St which is also single-family homes.

S. Belkin inquired how long it will take to tear down the temple. Mr. Luster said it could be between 60 and 90 days to do that part. He also said there may be some ledge on the site that they will have to contend with. Mr. Singleton said the demo may take closer to 60 days. Mr. Luster also confirmed that there is asbestos in the building but they are waiting zoning approval before performing the asbestos mitigation/removal study.

S. Belkin then asked about vegetation in the subdivision. Mr. Luster said that they will use vegetation along the property lines as the neighbors requested and include street trees. Mr. Callahan said that there were some abutters who were against the project but they have met with these families and talked with them about the new plans. These abutters now seem satisfied. When asked about the housing price point, Mr. Luster said they would be in the mid to high \$500,000s.

A. Ippolito asked if there were any changes to the house styles or materials since the original zoning article proposal. Mr. Luster confirmed that the house styles are the same and that they will use high quality materials and natural finishes.

Mr. Shutzer asked if they plan to seek zoning relief after the zoning article is approved in order to construct the subdivision. Mr. Singleton replied that they do not plan to need zoning relief; that they will go through site plan/subdivision review after the zoning article adoption.

The Board then opened the hearing to public comment.

Paul Minsky (15 Orchard Rd): I'm against the project. It's much too large. There will be an issue with parking. Lots of cars already and there's a school nearby. Lot is too small for the plan. Taxes will increase. It was a mistake to buy the property.

Charlie Donoghue (19 Orchard Rd): This is classic spot zoning. I believe that if we brought outside planners in and asked if they would recommend this, they would say no. The error was in buying the property. I went to the Selectmen's meeting when this proposal was approved. The neighbors that are direct abutters are large properties which will be right next to all these homes. Zoning is meant not to do any harm. I think six homes would be more consistent. I don't believe this revised language is all that substantial. I don't know anyone in my neighborhood that likes it.

On a motion by J. Blonder and seconded by A. Ippolito, the hearing was closed.

J. Blonder then moved to recommend favorable action to Town Meeting. Seconded by A. Ippolito and S. Belkin.  
Unanimous approval.

Meeting closed at 7:45p.

S. Peter Kane  
Town Planner

